

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are active in the case. Claims 9, 11 and 12 stand withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to an electronic device that employs an epoxy resin composition as a protective material.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 15 and 20 have been amended by introducing functional language therein which specifies that the epoxy resin component isolates and protects the circuitry of an electronic device from any nonaqueous solvent that leaks from the battery of the electronic device which otherwise would deleteriously affect the circuitry. Support for this limitation can be found in the first paragraph of page 20 of the specification. Accordingly, the amendment does not introduce new matter into the case and entry of the amendment into the record is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection, 35 USC 112, First Paragraph

As to the matter of the terms “nonaqueous solvent” and “secondary battery,” applicants point out that these terms can be found in original Claims 13 and 14. Therefore these terms constitute original disclosed subject matter in the case. Moreover, there is ample support for the nonaqueous electrolyte containing batteries in the specification, for instance on pages 19 and 20 of the text. Accordingly, it is clear that the battery component of the electronic device of the present invention contains a nonaqueous electrolyte.

As to the matter of the “secondary battery” of Claims 13 and 14, applicants point out that it is well known that a battery that has the capability of being recharged after discharge of the battery by use is a “secondary” battery. The term is a long-known and conventional

term of art in battery technology. (See Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary, for instance) A battery that can not be recharged is known as a primary battery. Since a secondary battery is mentioned in each of original Claims 13 and 14, secondary batteries have not been newly claimed in the response of May 14, 2007. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections based on the first and second paragraphs of 35 USC 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection, 35 USC 103

Claims 1-8, 10 and 13-19 stand rejected based on 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Clayton, U. S. Patent 6,049,975; Goldner et al, U.S. Patent 6,982,132 and JP 2001/2757 in view of Murai et al, U.S. Patent 6,437,090 and JP Nos. 58/187425 and 62/74919. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states in paragraph 4 of the Office Action that the present claims do not contain language which requires that deleterious contact of leaked nonaqueous solvent from a battery with an electronic circuit be prevented. However, Claim 1 has now been amended to recite such a feature. The stated function of the applied epoxy resin composition provides the nexus or junction between the electronic circuit of the claimed electronic device and the battery which supplies the electronic circuit of the device with electrical energy. The limitation newly introduced into the claims is therefore important in distinguishing the claimed invention from the cited and applied prior art which does not show or suggest the claimed combination of epoxy resin, latent catalyst (a combination of a phenol compound and an organometal compound), a butyral resin and an inorganic filler as components of a composition which isolates a battery in an electronic device from an electronic circuit.

Applicants maintain their position as stated with respect to the cited and applied prior art, in their remarks and comments in previous responses.

It is believed that the application is in proper condition for further consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Frederick D. Vastine, Ph.D.
Registration No. 27,013

NFO:FDV